

**REMARKS**

Claims 1, 3-7, 9-21, 47-50 and 70 remain for consideration in this application, with claims 1, 6, 7, and 70 being in independent format. Claim 1 has been amended. In view of the claims as they now stand, in combination with the remarks hereunder, the rejections of the last office action are respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 has been amended to further define the substrates to be used in the presently claimed method. In particular, the method is concerned with *blocking a stain* on a substrate to be painted, such as "a floor, ceiling, wall, decking or porch, door, door panel, flat stock, molding, furniture, cabinet, cabinet door, cabinet frame, window frame, and cementitious material or lumber suitable for making floors, ceilings, walls, decking or porches, doors, door panels, flat stock, molding, furniture, cabinets, cabinet doors, cabinet frames, and window frames." Express support for this amendment can be found in the specification at page 6, lines 16-23; page 28, lines 12-13.

Turning now to the Office Action. As an initial matter, Applicants note with appreciation, that the Examiner finds claims 6, 7, and 70 to be allowable over the art of record.

In the Office Action, claims 1, 3-5, 8, 9, 13-17, 20 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,162,492 to Narayanan. According to the Examiner, Narayanan discloses a correction material for covering mistakes "such as writing, typing or drawing, which require[s] the substrate to include[] paper" and the Examiner interprets the "recitation of wallpaper, wooden material or wooden-composite material to include paper." Office Action 11/15/2006, pages 2-3, ¶ 2. Although Applicants could take issue with this interpretation, claim 1 has been amended to specify that the presently claimed method is not directed towards correcting typographical errors on handwritten or typewritten sheets of paper, but rather towards *blocking stains* on walls, floors, furniture and other such substrates that are commonly painted or topcoated, and where stain-blocking is an issue. Accordingly, the method of claim 1 has been limited to a substrate comprising one or more of a "floor, ceiling, wall, decking or porch, door, door panel, flat stock, molding, furniture, cabinet, cabinet door, cabinet frame, window frame, and cementitious material or lumber suitable for making floors, ceilings, walls, decking or porches, doors, door panels, flat stock, molding,

furniture, cabinets, cabinet doors, cabinet frames, and window frames.” Applicants submit that there is no express or inherent teaching or suggestion of any of these substrates in the Narayanan reference.

Moreover, Applicants believe this amendment also addresses the Examiner’s assertion that the previously recited “wooden material” is encompassed by the recitation of “paper” in the Narayanan reference. Assuming *arguendo* that under the Examiner’s interpretation paper could be considered to be a “floors, ceilings, walls, decking or porches, doors, door panels, flat stock, molding, furniture, cabinets, cabinet doors, cabinet frames, and window frames” as recited in amended claim 1, are distinct and mutually exclusive types of uses for the recited lumber. Therefore, the term “lumber” as recited in claim 1 does not encompass every possible use for wood, but instead is limited to the specific suitable uses recited in the claim. Therefore, “paper” as disclosed in Narayanan cannot be considered to be within the scope of claim 1, and Applicants submit that a person of ordinary skill in the art would not interpret the term “paper” as falling within any of the categories of substrates recited in amended claim 1.

Nevertheless, even if the disclosed paper could be considered to be within the scope of the amended substrates, there is also no teaching or suggestion in the Narayanan reference of the step of “coating the substrate and the dry film layer with one or more liquid coating layers” as recited in claim 1. Specifically, there is a fundamental distinction between correcting a typographical mistake or drawing error by covering it with the correction material of Narayanan, and the presently claimed method of functionally *blocking a stain* so that it does not show through when that substrate is subsequently painted. In particular, the Narayanan reference discloses, in regards to liquid correction systems, that after covering up the writing, typing or drawing mistake on the sheet of paper, one could type over the correction material, or continue painting. Col. 1, lines 13-15. However, there is nothing in the reference to expressly or inherently teach or suggest that an entire liquid coating be applied over the substrate and dry film layer. Rather, the Narayanan reference discloses that the correction materials is “inscribable” indicating that after applying the correction material, one would type or write the correct word or letters on top of the material. The liquid coating is also not inherent in the disclosure of the Narayanan reference because typewritten or

handwritten sheets of paper are not typically coated with a liquid coating layer, nor are drawings. Further, if the drawing was to be coated with a liquid coating layer, then the correction material would not be needed because the mistake would already be covered by the liquid coating layer. Therefore, because the Narayanan reference fails to teach or suggest each and every claim limitation, it cannot be said to anticipate the claims. Accordingly, claim 1 is patentable over the art of record.

In the Office Action, claims 10-12, 18, 19, 47, and 50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Narayanan as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,891,562 to Rutz et al. Claim 48 is also rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Narayanan as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of G.B. Patent No. 2,196,580 to Sakurai. Each of these claims depend from claim 1, which has already been shown to be patentable over Narayanan above. Moreover, neither Rutz et al. nor Sakurai have been cited as remedying the deficiencies of the Narayanan reference with regard to claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claims 10-12, 18, 19, 47-48, and 50, while reciting additional patentable features, are also patentable over the art of record as depending from a patentable independent claim.

In view of the foregoing, the present application appears to be in condition for allowance. Again, Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for allowing claims 6, 7, and 70, and respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider the rejection(s), enter the above amendment, remove all rejections, and pass the application to issuance.

Respectfully submitted,

Eastman Chemical Company  
P.O. Box 511  
Kingsport, Tennessee 37662  
Phone: (423) 229-6204  
FAX: (423) 229-1239

Polly C. Owen  
Polly C. Owen  
Registration No. 44,991  
April 13<sup>th</sup>, 2007  
Date

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING UNDER 37 CFR 1.8(a)

I hereby certify that this paper (along with any referred to as being attached or enclosed) is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, Mail Stop Amendment, P. O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

Mary Harrison  
Mary Harrison

April 13, 2007  
Date